

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 01565 282132 Z

16

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 TRSE-00 OIC-04 IO-12 ACDA-19 CIAE-00

PM-09 INR-09 L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01

GAC-01 USIA-12 MBFR-03 SAJ-01 OMB-01 SS-14 NSC-10

RSR-01 /140 W

----- 046456

R 281847 Z MAR 73

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 9542

INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS 2822

AMEMBASSY BERN

AMEMBASSY HELSINKI

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

C O N F I D E N T I A L USNATO 1565

E. O. 11652: GDS, 12-31-79

TAGS: PFOR

SUBJECT: CSCE: SITE FOR CONFERENCE

HELSINKI FOR USDEL MPT

REF: STATE 43509

SUMMARY: INITIAL SENIOR POLADS DISCUSSION OF SITE OR SITES FOR CSCE REVEALED EXPECTED DIVISION OF VIEWS WITH SCANDINAVIANS STRONGLY FOR KEEPING ALL PHASES IN HELSINKI, SOUTHERN EUROPEANS GENERALLY IN FAVOR OF OTHER SITES FOR PHASES 2 AND 3, AND REMAINING ALLIES SOMEWHERE IN MIDDLE. US REP DREW ON REFTEL IN EXPRESSING OUR SUPPORT FOR HELSINKI AS SITE FOR PHASE 1 AND OUR VIEW THAT HELSINKI HAD ADEQUATE PHYSICAL FACILITIES FOR PHASE 2 AS WELL. REACHING ALLIED CONSENSUS ON THIS POINT MAY TAKE SOME TIME. END SUMMARY.

1. ITALIAN REP OPENED DISCUSSION WITH STATEMENT THAT IT WAS " BASIC PRINCIPLE" FOR ROME THAT THERE SHOULD BE NO CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 01565 282132 Z

CONCENTRATION OF CSCE IN ONE CAPITAL. ITALIANS COULD GO ALONG WITH HELSINKI AS SITE FOR FIRST PHASE IF MAJORITY

SUPPORTED IT. HOWEVER, ROME WAS OPPOSED TO PUTTING SECOND STAGE IN HELSINKI AND PREFERRED VIENNA, BUT COULD ACCEPT A SITE IN SWITZERLAND. ITALIAN REP MENTIONED NEW FINNISH LINK WITH CEMA AS INDICATION OF FINLAND'S LACK OF NEUTRALITY. ON PHASE 3 ITALIAN REP SAID DISCUSSION OF SITE WAS PREMATURE BUT THAT ROME WAS DEFINITELY OPPOSED TO HELSINKI. GREEK AND TURKISH REPS GENERALLY SUPPORTED ITALIAN POSITION. ALTHOUGH FRG HAD NO COMPLAINTS ABOUT FINNISH NEUTRALITY, FRG REP SAID BONN BELIEVED SECOND AND THIRD PHASES OF CSCE SHOULD BE IN DIFFERENT CITIES THAN HELSINKI. HE ADDED THAT SWISS HAD RECENTLY TOLD GERMANS THAT GENEVA HAD FACILITIES FOR ALL COMMITTEES, AND HE SUGGESTED THAT HELSINKI MIGHT NOT HAVE REALLY ADEQUATE FACILITIES. ON THIRD PHASE, FRG REP AGREED WITH ITALIANS THAT DECISION WAS PREMATURE BUT THAT IT SHOULD BE ELSEWHERE THAN HELSINKI.

2. THREE SCANDINAVIAN REPS STRONGLY SUPPORTED HELSINKI AS SITE FOR ALL THREE PHASES OF CSCE AS LONG AS FINNISH INVITATION REMAINED ON TABLE. NOT SURPRISINGLY, SCANDINAVIAN REPS TOOK EXCEPTION TO ITALIAN CLAIM OF NON- NEUTRAL BEHAVIOR BY FINNS.

3. ALL OTHER DELEGATIONS SUPPORTED HOLDING PHASE 1 IN HELSINKI. WITH EXCEPTION OF NETHERLANDS REP WHO ARGUED THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT PREMATURELY REJECT SOLUTION OF HOLDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS IN SEVERAL CITIES, ALL DELEGATIONS FAVORED PRINCIPLE OF " CO- LOCATION" FOR SECOND PHASE. SEVERAL DELEGATIONS, INCLUDING UK, FRANCE, NETHERLANDS, LUXEMBOURG, PORTUGAL AND BELGIUM, SAID THEIR AUTHORITIES WERE OPEN- MINDED ON SITE FOR SECOND PHASE AND CERTAINLY DID NOT RULE OUT HELSINKI. US REP DREW ON REFTTEL EXPRESSING OUR SUPPORT FOR HELSINKI AS SITE FOR FIRST PHASE AND OUR VIEW THAT HELSINKI OFFERED ADEQUATE FACILITIES FOR SECOND PHASE.

4. IN SUMMING- UP, CHAIRMAN NOTED GENERAL CONSENSUS ON HOLDING FIRST PHASE IN HELSINKI AND SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES INFORMALLY SO INDICATE TO FINNS. HOWEVER, ITALIAN REP OBJECTED THAT ALLIES AT THIS POINT SHOULD SPEAK ONLY FOR THEMSELVES AND THAT THEY SHOULD NOT AT THIS TIME INDICATE TO FINNS THAT THERE WAS GENUINE NATO CONSENSUS IN FAVOR OF HELSINKI AS SITE FOR FIRST PHASE. HE INDICATED, HOWEVER, THAT ITALIANS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 01565 282132 Z

RECOGNIZED FACT THAT HELSINKI WOULD BE SITE FOR FIRST PHASE AND THAT ITALIAN POSITION WAS PURELY TACTICAL.

5. COMMENT: LINE- UP AMONG ALLIES AT PRESENT HAS LARGE UNDECIDED GROUP IN MIDDLE WHICH IS TENDING TOWARD HELSINKI AS SITE FOR SECOND PHASE. HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT DETERMINED EFFORT BY SWISS OR AUSTRIANS TO SECURE SECOND PHASE COULD RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL DEFECTIONS AMONG THIS GROUP, SEVERAL OF WHOM FEAR THAT THEIR HELSINKI EMBASSIES WILL

SIMPLY BE UNABLE TO SERVICE THE RELATIVELY LARGE DELEGATIONS
THEY WILL NEED FOR THE SECOND PHASE.
RUMSFELD

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 28 MAR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973NATO01565
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730346/abqcdxip.tel
Line Count: 114
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: STATE 43509
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE: SITE FOR CONFERENCE
TAGS: PFOR
To: STATE INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
BERN
HELSINKI
MOSCOW
VIENNA
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

